



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/219,195	12/21/1998	FRANCIS CHEE-SHUEN LEE	SA997115	2143

7590 09/04/2003  
BRIAN C. KUNZLER  
10 WEST 100 SOUTH  
SUITE 425  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

CASTRO, ANGELA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2653

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

31

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/219,195

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Angel A Castro

Art Unit

2653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20,27-37,39 and 41-43 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17,21,22,24-26,38 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/23/03 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 14-17, 38, 21, 22, 40, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arisaka et al (U.S. Pat. 5,930,082).

Regarding claims 14 and 21-22, Arisaka et al discloses a suspension assembly (figures 1-2) comprising:

a slider/head assembly 2 having a connecting end;

a suspension 3 having a connecting end and electrically conducting paths 6; and

an interconnect module 1 coupling the connecting ends of the suspension and the slider/head assembly to route one or more data signals between the electrically conducting paths and the slider/head assembly, such that the connecting end of the suspension is positioned in a first direction and the connecting end of the slider/head is positioned in a second direction (see figure 2).

Regarding claim 24, Arisaka et al further discloses:

a disk 20 (figure 10A);

a spindle motor 45 positioned to support and rotate the disk;

an actuator 44 coupled to the suspension assembly and operable to position the suspension assembly above the disk to access the disk for reading and/or writing operations.

Regarding claims 15, 25, 38 and 40, Arisaka et al discloses that the suspension is an integrated lead suspension (column 10, lines 5-7).

As the claims are directed to a suspension assembly, per se, the method limitations appearing in line 2 of claims 16 and 26 have only been accorded weight to the extent that it/they affects the structure of the completed suspension assembly. Note that "determination of patentability in 'product-by-process' claims is based on product itself, even though such claims are limited and defined by process [i.e., "in-line mounting"], and thus product in such claim is unpatentable if it is the same as, or obvious form, product of prior art, even if prior product was made by a different process", *In re Thorpe, et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985).

Furthermore, note that a "product-by-process claim, although reciting subject matter of claim in terms of how it is made [i.e., "in-line mounting"] is still product claim; it is patentability of product claimed and not recited process steps that must be established, in spite of fact that

Art Unit: 2653

claim may recite only process limitations", *In re Hirao and Sato*, 190 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1976).

Regarding claim 17, Arisaka shows that slider/head assembly is orthogonally mounted onto the suspension (see figure 2).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-17, 38, 21-23, 40 and 24-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fan et al (U.S. Pat. 5,959,808 and 5,982,585) discloses a rotary electrostatic microactuator.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel A Castro whose telephone number is 703-308-8435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8 AM to 6 PM.

Art Unit: 2653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R Korzuch can be reached on 703-305-6137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

  
Angel Castro, Ph.D.